

not properly rejected. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance so that the case may pass to issuance. In any event, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference do not teach the limitations set forth in Claim 10. Among advantages for example, Applicants claim method allows a mobile device that has for example limited size requirements and power requirements, to facilitate suitable graphics rendering while maintaining an extended mobile device battery life.

For example, Claim 10 requires, among other things, receiving a generate\_event command from a graphics engine such that the generate\_event command provides a memory access request to perform a memory operation, beginning the performance of the memory operation, receiving a wait\_until command and in response to this command, waiting until the memory operation is complete and then providing at least one rendering command to a command processor. The Office Action admits that Van Hook does not teach, among other things, in response to a wait\_until command, waiting until the memory operation is complete which is in response to the generate\_event command that provides a memory access request to perform a memory operation. Instead, Migdal would apparently be cited as teaching this subject matter.

Migdal is directed to a multichip synchronization scheme wherein the WaitSyncID command “causes the R chips to block until all R chips have reached sync point i in g’s command string. This command is broadcast to all R chips.” (Column 10, lines 12-14). As such, the WaitSyncID command in Migdal stalls multiple chips until all chips have reached the sync point identified in the command. As such, Migdal is directed to load balancing across multiple chips using a WaitSyncID command to sync across the multiple chips. Proper synchronization described in Migdal is the synchronization across multiple chips, not the synchronization between rendering commands in the same command queue. Moreover, Applicants’ claimed wait\_until command causes the command queue to queue the rendering

commands until completion of the generate\_event command. Applicants are unable to find such an operation as the WaitSyncID command does not appear to cause the rendering commands in the command queue that contains the WaitSyncID command, but again as noted above, the Migdal WaitSyncID command is used to sync up operations across multiple chips. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hook et al. and Migdal et al. and Shimizu. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is allowable at least depending from an allowable base claim.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/22/05

By: Christopher J. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005